

REMARKS

Claims 1-83 are pending in the instant action. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14, 16, 17, 19-36, 38-61, 63, 64, 66-83 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,765,138 to Aycock et al. ("Aycock"). Claims 15, 18, 37, 62, and 65 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aycock. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 17, 20, 37, 45-52, 54-56, 64, and 67 have been amended. Claims 6, 19, 24, 25, 53, 66, 71, and 72 have been cancelled. New claims 84 and 85 have been added. The Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered.

Claim rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-14, 16, 17, 19-36, 38-61, 63, 64, 66-83 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Aycock. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 48. Amended claims 1 and 48 recite a method and storage medium for facilitating product development and procurement functions in a communications network, comprising: "receiving a request from a first enterprise system to contact a web site maintained by a second enterprise system, said second enterprise system authenticating a user ID and password of a user of said first enterprise system; in response to receiving a request to complete a survey, providing the first enterprise system with access to a survey form stored in a database that is replicated at the second enterprise system; receiving response data solicited in said survey form; updating a database at the second enterprise system with the response data, the updating including storing the response data in one of a draft mode and a final mode designated by the first enterprise system; wherein said second enterprise system includes a development toolkit network tool for executing product development and procurement activities." Aycock does not recite these features. Specifically, Aycock does not teach or suggest communications initiated by a first enterprise accessing a web site of a second enterprise. Nor does Aycock recite authenticating a user ID and password of the first enterprise that is

YOR920000503US1

accessing information at the web site of the second enterprise. Aycock further does not teach or suggest replicating a database in response to a request to receive a survey form and updating a database at the second enterprise system with response data provided in the survey form. Also, Aycock does not teach designating a draft mode or final mode indicator for the response data stored in the database. Rather Aycock teaches inter-enterprise access to information, e.g., "the business terminal system 70 provides a graphic user interface for a system designer designing the RFPRFQ and a buyer evaluating suppliers (co. 10, lines 23-25). This access refers to individuals or groups within an enterprise (i.e., system designer and a buyer of an organization). The only access taught by Aycock *between enterprises* (e.g., a supplier and a buyer) occurs via uploading and downloading electronic data files from and to a supplier site (col. 9, lines 50-52). Aycock also teaches vendor requirements "are selected for a vendor qualification, ...and the vendor requirements are provided to a supplier, for example in the form of software which may be downloaded from the evaluator's business system to the supplier's sales department" (col. 2, line 64 – col. 3, line 3). No software or downloading is required or utilized as provided in the instant claims 1 and 48. Thus, Aycock does not teach access to information via a web site between two enterprises. Nor does Aycock teach accessing information via database replication between the two enterprises which supports the protection of data at the second enterprise while enabling instant updates to information. Finally, Aycock does not teach or suggest designating a draft mode or final mode to information provided by a first enterprise when storing the information. Differentiating between saving a document in draft mode versus final mode enables the second enterprise to forestall the integration of information provided by the first enterprise that may not yet be final or complete. Accordingly, because Aycock does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claims 1 and 48, the Applicants submit that claims 1 and 48 are patentable over Aycock and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

YOR920000503US1

Claims 6 and 53 have been cancelled. Claims 2-5, 7-14, and 16 depend what is now an allowable claim 1. Claims 49-52, 54-61, and 63 depend from what is now an allowable claim 48. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 2-5, 7-14, 16, 49-52, 54-61, and 63 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

Applicants' amended claims 17 and 64 recite, respectively, a method and storage medium for facilitating product development and procurement functions, comprising: "receiving a notification by a remote user of a second enterprise system, said notification including data relating to a supplier survey, the notification generated in response to an assignment of a final mode designator to the supplier survey; wherein the designator is assigned by the first enterprise." As described above with respect to claims 1 and 48, Aycock does not recite assigning a designator to a survey. By assigning a final mode designator to a supplier survey, the supplier (e.g., first enterprise) is indicating that the survey is ready for evaluation, thus, triggering a notification to be generated by the second enterprise system to a remote user who then evaluates the contents of the survey as recited in claims 17 and 64. Aycock does not teach or suggest receiving a notification regarding a survey that is generated in response to the assignment of a final mode designator provided by the first enterprise system. Nor does Aycock teach or suggest providing access to a replicated database. Accordingly, because Aycock does not recite each and every feature of Applicants claims 17 and 64, claims 17 and 64 are patentable over Aycock. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

Claims 19 and 66 have been cancelled. Claims 20-23 depend from what is now an allowable claim 17. Claims 67-70 depend from what is now an allowable claim 64. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 19, 20-23, 64, and 67-70 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

YOR920000503US1

Applicants further submit that claims 26 and 73 are patentable over Aycock for at least the reasons provided above with respect to claims 1 and 48. Claims 27-36 depend from what is an allowable claim 26. Claims 74-83 depend from what is an allowable claim 73. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 26-36 and claims 73-83 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

Claims 38-47 depend from what is an allowable claim 37. Claim 37 is allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 48. For at least the reason that claims 38-47 depend from an allowable claim 37, the Applicants submit that claims 38-47 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections.

New claims 84 and 85 recite a method and storage medium, respectively, for facilitating product development and procurement functions. The Applicants submit that new claims 84 and 85 are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons presented above.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 15, 18, 37, 62, and 65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aycock. Claim 15 depends from what is an allowable claim 1. Claim 18 depends from an allowable claim 17. Claim 37 is patentable over Aycock for at least the reasons set forth above. Claim 62 depends from an allowable claim 48. Claim 65 depends from an allowable claim 64. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 15, 18, 37, 62, and 65 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

YOR920000503US1

Conclusion

No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-0150 maintained by Applicants' Assignee.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By Marisa J. Dubuc
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Customer No. 23413

Date: September 30, 2004
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929

YOR920000503US1